

Remarks

The applicants have amended claims 1 and 8. Claims 1-14 are currently pending. In light of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks, the applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the pending rejections and advancement of this application to allowance.

A. Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 1 and 8 stand rejected as using an improper Markush group because the claims use the term "comprising" instead of "consisting of." The applicants thank the examiner for pointing out this issue and have amended claims 1 and 8 to use the term "consisting of." This amendment is within the original intended scope of the pending claims and does not limit the scope of the pending claims. The applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the pending rejection.

B. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

1. Claims 1 and 8

Claims 1 and 8 stand rejected as being obvious over Dave in view of Markov and further in view of Kalavade. The applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 1 is directed to generating computer system level architectures that are capable of executing multiple functional specifications. It sets forth the act of "forming an initial master task graph from said multiple specifications." While not so limited, this method enables synthesizing a large pool of architectures and then identifying the better architectures within the pool.

Claim 8 similarly is directed to an article of manufacture for generating system level architectures that are capable of executing multiple functional specifications. It sets forth a plurality of instructions configured to cause a processor to "form an initial master task graph from said multiple specifications."

In sharp contrast, all of the cited references fail to teach or suggest forming an initial master task graph from multiple specifications or any other method or structure that would enable synthesizing a large pool of architectures and identifying the better architectures within the pool. For example, as admitted in the office action, Dave fails to teach "forming an initial

master task graph from multiple specifications." There is no teaching or suggestion about how to form architectures capable of executing multiple specifications.

Markov also fails to teach "forming an initial master task graph from multiple specifications." Rather, Markov teaches creating candidate architectures (106) and implementation specifications (114) from a single behavioral specification (108). See, e.g., col. 4., ll. 46-62; col. 5., ll. 12-30.

Finally, even if Kalavade teaches multiple specifications as the office action asserts, it still fails to teach or suggest, "forming an initial master task graph from multiple specifications." Rather, its teaching is directed to identifying "nodes that represent similar functionality across different applications." See Introduction. This teaching is not forming an initial master task graph.

Therefore, no combination of the three cited references teaches a method or an article that includes forming an initial master task graph from said multiple specifications. The applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the pending rejection.

2. Claims 2 and 9

Claims 2 and 9 stand rejected as being obvious over Dave in view of Markov, in view of Kalavade, and further in view of Wolf. The applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 2 depends from claim 1 and includes all of the elements of claim 1, which is patentable because of at least the reasons stated above. Similarly, claim 9 depends from claim 8 and includes all of the elements of claim 8, which is patentable because of at least the reasons stated above. Therefore, the applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the pending rejection.

3. Claims 3 and 10

Claims 3 and 10 stand rejected as being obvious over Dave in view of Markov, in view of Kalavade, and further in view of Wolf. The applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 3 depends from claim 2 and includes all of the elements of claim 2, which is patentable because of at least the reasons stated above. Similarly, claim 10 depends from claim 9 and includes all of the elements of claim 9, which is patentable because of at least the reasons stated above. Therefore, the applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the pending rejection.

4. Claims 4 and 11

Claims 4 and 11 stand rejected as being obvious over Dave in view of Markov, and further in view of Kalavade. The applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 4 depends from claim 1 and includes all of the elements of claim 1, which is patentable because of at least the reasons stated above. Similarly, claim 11 depends from claim 8 and includes all of the elements of claim 8, which is patentable because of at least the reasons stated above. Therefore, the applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the pending rejection.

5. Claims 5 and 12

Claims 5 and 12 stand rejected as being obvious over Dave in view of Markov, in view of Kalavade, and further in view of Dick. The applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 5 depends from claim 1 and includes all of the elements of claim 1, which is patentable because of at least the reasons stated above. Similarly, claim 12 depends from claim 8 and includes all of the elements of claim 8, which is patentable because of at least the reasons stated above. Therefore, the applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the pending rejection.

6. Claims 6 and 13

Claims 6 and 13 stand rejected as being obvious over Dave in view of Markov, and further in view of Kalavade. The applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 6 depends from claim 1 and includes all of the elements of claim 1, which is patentable because of at least the reasons stated above. Similarly, claim 13 depends from claim 8 and includes all of the elements of claim 8, which is patentable because of at least the reasons stated above. Therefore, the applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the pending rejection.

7. Claims 7 and 14

Claims 7 and 14 stand rejected as being obvious over Dave in view of Markov, and further in view of Kalavade. The applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 7 depends from claim 1 and includes all of the elements of claim 1, which is patentable because of at least the reasons stated above. Similarly, claim 14 depends from claim 8 and includes all of the elements of claim 8, which is patentable because of at least the reasons

stated above. Therefore, the applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the pending rejection.

Conclusion

In light of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the applicants request withdrawal of the pending rejections and allowance of all the pending claims. Although certain arguments were set forth supporting the patentability of the claims, the applicants note there may be other reasons and arguments that the original claims and the amended claims are patentably distinct. The applicants reserve the right to raise any such argument in the future and to pursue any claim scope in the future that is supported by the disclosure set forth in the application.

Please contact the undersigned attorney if there are any questions.

Respectfully submitted,

MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.
P.O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-0903
(612) 322-5300

Date:

June 9, 2005



A large, stylized handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "John C. Reich".

John C. Reich
Reg. No. 37,703
JCR:SZ